arXiv:1301.2747v1 [math.CO] 13 Jan 2013

# A Study on the Amount of Random Graph Groupies

Daodi Lu [*]

January 15, 2013

**Abstract**

In 1980, Ajtai, Komlos and Szemerédi defined "groupie": Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph, $|V| = n$, $|E| = e$. For a vertex $v \in V$, let $r(v)$ denote the sum of the degrees of the vertices adjacent to $v$. We say $v \in V$ is a *groupie*, if $\frac{r(v)}{\deg(v)} \geq \frac{e}{n}$. In this paper, we prove that in random graph $B(n, p)$, $0 < p < 1$, the proportion of groupies converges in probability towards $\Phi(1) \approx 0.8413$ as $n$ approaches infinity, where $\Phi(x)$ is the distribution function of standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$. We also discuss the asymptotic behavior of the proportion of groupies in complete bipartite graph $B(n_1, n_2, p)$.

## 1 Introduction

The definition of groupie was first given in [1]. In that paper, Ajtai, Komlos and Szemerédi used the fact that every nonempty simple graph has at least one groupie to give an upper bound for Ramsey number $R(3, k)$.

**Definition 1** *Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a nonempty simple graph, with $|V| = n$ and $|E| = e$. For a vertex $v$ of $G$, denote by $r(v)$ the sum of the degrees of neighbors of $v$. The vertex $v$ is called a groupie, if the average degree of the neighbors of $v$ is not less than the average degree of all vertices in $G$, i.e.*

$$\frac{r(v)}{\deg(v)} \geq \frac{e}{n}. \tag{1}$$

*For the case that $v$ is isolated, $v$ is a groupie if and only if all vertices in $G$ are isolated.*

---

[*] Department of Mathematics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA. dlu@caltech.edu

The references [4], [10], [9], and [8] discuss the properties of groupies in simple graphs. Mackey [9] proved that there are at least two groupies in any simple graphs with at least two vertices. The original definition of groupie was revised in [6] and [11]. In these papers, the term "groupie" is defined as a vertex whose degree is not less than the average degree of its neighbors in a simple graph. Fernandez de la Vega and Tuza [6] proved that the proportion of groupie in graph $B(n,p)$ is almost always very near to $\frac{1}{2}$ as $n \to \infty$. Shang [11] investigated the amount of groupies in bipartite graph $B(n_1, n_2, p)$, and proved that the proportion of groupie in $B(n_1, n_2, p)$ is almost always very near to $\frac{1}{2}$ when $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$ and $n_1 = n_2$. However, he did not show whether the proportion of groupies converges in probability when $n_1, n_2$ go to infinity together in general case. In our paper, the term "groupie" is used as Definition 1. In Section 2, we will investigate the proportion of groupie defined in Definition 1 in a random graph $B(n,p)$. As the number of vertices $n \to \infty$, the proportion of groupie converges in probability towards $\Phi(1) \approx 0.8413$, where $\Phi(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$. The main result in this section is:

**Theorem 1** *Suppose $G = B(n,p)$, $0 < p < 1$, is a complete random simple graph on $n$ vertices. Let $N(n)$ be the number of groupies in $G$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$P\left(\left|\frac{N(n)}{n} - \Phi(1)\right| > \epsilon\right) \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \tag{2}$$

*where $\Phi(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution $N(0,1)$.*

In Section 3, we will discuss the asymptotic behavior of the proportion of groupie in a random bipartite graphs $B(n_1, n_2, p)$ as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$ and the ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2} \to \alpha$, where $\alpha$ is a fixed nonnegative number. If $|n_1 - n_2| \to \infty$ as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, the proportion of groupies in $B(n_1, n_2, p)$ converges in probability towards $\frac{\max(1,\alpha)}{1+\alpha}$, while when $\alpha = 1$ and $n_1 - n_2 = c$ where $c$ is a fixed integer, the proportion of groupies converges in probability towards $\frac{1}{2}(\Phi(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}) + \Phi(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}))$. This limit is monotone decreasing with the absolute value of $c$. When $c = 0$, the limit is $\Phi(1) \approx 0.8413$. As $|c|$ is large, it is near to $\frac{1}{2}$, which coincides with the limit when $\alpha = 1$ and $|n_1 - n_2| \to \infty$ as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$.

## 2 In The Complete Random Graph $B(n,p)$

In random graph $G = B(n,p)$, denote the $n$ vertices to be $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$. For $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let $A_k$ be the event "The vertex $v_k$ is a groupie". Let $X_k$ be the characteristic function of $A_k$, i.e. $X_k = 1_{A_k}$.

We claim that we can exclude the case that there exists an isolated vertex in graph $G$, because as $n \to \infty$,

$$P(\text{there exists an isolated vertex in } B(n,p)) \leq n \cdot (1-p)^{n-1} \to 0.$$

We first prove:

**Lemma 2** *The limit* $\lim_{n\to\infty} E[X_1] - \Phi(1)$ *is equal to* $0$.

Note that $E[X_1] = P(A_1)$, i.e. $E[X_1]$ is the probability that the vertex $v_1$ is a groupie. Suppose $i$ is the degree of $v_1$. In a graph $G = B(n,p)$, let $V_1$ be the set of $i$ vertices which are adjacent to $v_1$; $V_2$ the set of $n-1-i$ vertices which are not adjacent to $v_1$; $e_1$ the number of edges whose two vertices are all in the vertex set $V_1$; $e_2$ the number of edges whose two vertices are all in the vertex set $V_2$; $e_3$ the number of edges with one vertex in the vertex set $V_1$, and the other vertex in $V_2$. Then the event $A_1$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{2(i+e_1+e_2+e_3)}{n} \leq \frac{i+2e_1+e_3}{i},$$

i.e.

$$2(n-i)e_1 + (n-2i)(e_3+i) - 2ie_2 \geq 0.$$

Note that the conditional expectation

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[2(n-i)e_1 + (n-2i)(e_3+i) - 2ie_2; i] \\
=&ip((n-i)(i-1) + (n-2i)(n-1-i) - (n-1-i)(n-2-i)) + (n-2i)i \\
=&i((n-2)p + (n-2i)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the conditional variance

$$\begin{aligned}
&Var[2(n-i)e_1 + (n-2i)(e_3+i) - 2ie_2; i] \\
=&\bigg( (2(n-i))^2 \frac{i(i-1)}{2} + (n-2i)^2 i(n-1-i) \\
&+ (2i)^2 \frac{(n-1-i)(n-2-i)}{2} \bigg)(p-p^2) \\
\triangleq&\sigma^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $i \sim B(n-1,p)$, for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, we can pick $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n > N_0$, $P(|i - pn| \geq n^{0.5}\Omega(n)) < \epsilon_0$, where $\Omega(n)$ approaches infinity as $n \to \infty$, with the speed slower than any power of $n$. Denote by $F_1(x)$, $F_2(x)$, $F_3(x)$ the cumulative distribution function of the binomial random variables $\frac{2(n-i)e_1}{\sigma}$, $\frac{-2ie_2}{\sigma}$, $\frac{(n-2i)e_3}{\sigma}$, and let $\Phi_1(x)$, $\Phi_2(x)$, $\Phi_3(x)$ be the cumulative distribution function of the normal distribution in central limit theorem corresponding to these binomial random variables. Suppose $X, X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent identically distributed $d$-dimensional random vectors, and $X = (X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(d)})$. In addition, suppose the third moment of all components of $X$ exist, and the first moment $E[X] = 0$. Let

$$Y = \frac{X_1 + \ldots + X_n}{n},$$

$F(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ the cumulative distribution function of $Y$, and $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ the cumulative distribution function of the $d$-dimensional normal distribution $\widetilde{Y}$ that has the same first moment and covariance matrix as $Y$. By the Berry-Esseen Theorem [3][7][2][5], there exist a constant $C(d)$ that only depends on the dimension $d$, so that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |F(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \frac{C(d)}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{E[|X^{(i)}|^3]}{(E[(X^{(i)})^2])^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

By the 1-dimensional Berry-Esseen theorem[3][7], there exists a constant $C$ that does not depend on $n, i, p$, so that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_j(x) - \Phi_j(x)| < \frac{C(p^2 + (1-p)^2)}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{E_j}}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $E_j$ denote the number of random edges which influence $e_j$, after given the degree $i$ of vertex $v_1$, for example, $E_1 = \binom{i}{2}$.

If $|i - pn| < n^{0.5}\Omega(n)$, we have $\frac{1}{\sqrt{E_j}} < C_1 n^{-1}$, then

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_j(x) - \Phi_j(x)| < C_2 \cdot n^{-1},$$

where $C_1$ and $C_2$ are constants which depend on $p$.

We claim an easy proposition, which is useful to generalize results in Berry-Esseen theorem for i.i.d. random vectors.

**Proposition 1** *Suppose $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$, and $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n$ are independent $d$-dimensional random vectors, $d \geq 1$, with cumulative distribution functions $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n$, and $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_n$. Let*

$$X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n,$$

$$Y = Y_1 + \ldots + Y_n,$$

*and* $F, G$ *the cumulative distribution functions of* $X, Y$. *If*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |F_k(x) - G_k(x)| \le \epsilon_k,$$

*where* $1 \le k \le n$, *then*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |F(x) - G(x)| \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_i.$$

The proof of Proposition 1 can be given by induction on the number $n$ of summands in $X$ and $Y$.

We go back to the proof of Lemma 2. By Proposition 1, there exist a constant $C_3$ which only depends on $p$, so that

$$\left| P(A_1; |i - pn| < n^{0.5}\Omega(n)) - \Phi\left(\frac{i(n-2)p + (n-2i)}{\sigma}\right) \right| < C_3 \cdot n^{-1}.$$

Since $\Phi(x)$ is continuous,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \Phi\left(\frac{i(n-2)p + (n-2i)}{\sigma}\right) = \Phi(1).$$

In addition, since $P(|i - pn| \ge n^{0.5}\Omega(n)) < \epsilon_0$,

$$|P(A_1) - P(A_1; |i - pn| < n^{0.5}\Omega(n))| < \epsilon_0.$$

Since the choice of $\epsilon_0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P(A_1) - \Phi(1) = 0.$$

Lemma 2 is proved. $\square$

We will prove another lemma.

**Lemma 3** *The limit* $\lim_{n \to \infty} Cov[X_1, X_2]$ *is equal to 0.*

We have changed the definition of the vertex sets $V_1, V_2$ in this part: Let $V_1$ be the set of vertices which are adjacent to $v_1$, but not adjacent to $v_2$, and its size $|V_1| = i_1$; $V_2$ the set of vertices which are adjacent to both $v_1$ and $v_2$, and its size $|V_2| = i_2$; $V_3$ the set of vertices which are adjacent to $v_2$, but not adjacent to $v_1$, and its size $|V_3| = i_3$; $V_4$ the set of vertices which are not adjacent to either $v_1$ or $v_2$, and its size $|V_4| = i_4 = n - 2 - i_1 - i_2 - i_3$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[X_1X_2]\\
=&P(A_1 \wedge A_2 \wedge v_1 \sim v_2) + P(A_1 \wedge A_2 \wedge v_1 \nsim v_2)\\
=&p \cdot P(A_1 \wedge A_2 | v_1 \sim v_2) + (1-p) \cdot P(A_1 \wedge A_2 \wedge v_1 \nsim v_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $e_{jk}$,$1 \leq j \leq k \leq 4$, be the number of edges whose two vertices are in $V_j$ and $V_k$, respectively.

If $v_1$ is adjacent to $v_2$, the event $A_1 \wedge A_2$ is equivalent to the following inequalities:

$$\begin{cases}
B_1 \triangleq 2(n-(i_1+i_2+1))(e_{11}+e_{22}+e_{12}+i_2)\\
\ +(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))(e_{13}+e_{14}+e_{23}+e_{24}+(i_1+i_2+i_3+1))\\
\ -2(i_1+i_2+1)(e_{33}+e_{34}+e_{44}) \geq 0\\
\\
B_2 \triangleq 2(n-(i_3+i_2+1))(e_{33}+e_{22}+e_{23}+i_2)\\
\ +(n-2(i_3+i_2+1))(e_{13}+e_{34}+e_{12}+e_{24}+(i_1+i_2+i_3+1))\\
\ -2(i_3+i_2+1)(e_{11}+e_{14}+e_{44}) \geq 0.
\end{cases}$$

Since the $e_{jk}$'s are independent when the value of $i_1, i_2, i_3$ is fixed, then the conditional expectation and variance of $B_1$ and $B_2$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
E[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= (n-(i_1+i_2+1))((n-2)p + (n-2(i_1+i_2+1))),\\
E[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= (n-(i_3+i_2+1))((n-2)p + (n-2(i_3+i_2+1))),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3]\\
=&\Bigg[(2(n-(i_1+i_2+1)))^2\frac{(i_1+i_2+1)(i_1+i_2)}{2}\\
&+(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))^2(i_1+i_2+1)(n-1-(i_1+i_2+1))\\
&+(2(i_1+i_2+1))^2\frac{(n-1-(i_1+i_2+1))(n-2-(i_1+i_2+1))}{2}\Bigg](p-p^2),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3]\\
=&\Bigg[(2(n-(i_3+i_2+1)))^2\frac{(i_3+i_2+1)(i_3+i_2)}{2}\\
&+(n-2(i_3+i_2+1))^2(i_3+i_2+1)(n-1-(i_3+i_2+1))\\
&+(2(i_2+i_3+1))^2\frac{(n-1-(i_3+i_2+1))(n-2-(i_3+i_2+1))}{2}\Bigg](p-p^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, the conditional covariance of $B_1$ and $B_2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Cov}[B_1, B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] \\
=&\Big[ -4(n-(i_1+i_2+1))(i_2+i_3+1)\binom{i_1}{2} \\
&+4(n-(i_1+i_2+1))(n-(i_2+i_3+1))\binom{i_2}{2} \\
&-4(n-(i_2+i_3+1))(i_1+i_2+1)\binom{i_3}{2} \\
&+4(i_1+i_2+1)(i_2+i_3+1)\binom{n-2-i_1-i_2-i_3}{2} \\
&+2(n-(i_1+i_2+1))(n-2(i_2+i_3+1))i_1 i_2 \\
&+(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))(n-2(i_2+i_3+1))i_1 i_3 \\
&-2(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))(i_2+i_3+1)i_1(n-2-i_1-i_2-i_3) \\
&+2(n-(i_2+i_3+1))(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))i_2 i_3 \\
&+(n-2(i_1+i_2+1))(n-2(i_2+i_3+1))i_2(n-2-i_1-i_2-i_3) \\
&-2(i_1+i_2+1)(n-2(i_2+i_3+1))i_3(n-2-i_1-i_2-i_3)\Big](p-p^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Treat $B = (B_1, B_2)$ as a 2-dimensional random vector. Denote by $F(x_1, x_2)$ the cumulative distribution function of $\frac{B}{n^2}$, $N = (N_1, N_2)$ the normal distribution with the same expectation and covariance matrix of $\frac{B}{n^2}$, and $\Phi(x_1, x_2)$ the cumulative distribution function of $N$.

Note that the contribution of $e_{jk}$, $1 \le j \le k \le 4$, to $B_1, B_2$ are linear, by Berry-Esseen theorem of independent identically distributed sequence on $\mathbb{R}^d$ proved by Bergström [2][5], and Proposition 1, If we have

**Condition 1** $|i_1 - np(1-p)| \le n^{0.5}\Omega(n)$, $|i_2 - np^2| \le n^{0.5}\Omega(n)$, $|i_3 - np(1-p)| \le n^{0.5}\Omega(n)$,

then there exists a constant $C_3$ which only depends on $p$, so that

$$\sup |F(x_1, x_2) - \Phi(x_1, x_2)| < C_3 \cdot n^{-1}.$$

When $n \to \infty$, and Condition 1 holds, we have

$$\mathrm{Var}[B_j; i_1, i_2, i_3] = n^4 \mathrm{Var}[N_j; i_1, i_2, i_3] = O(n^4), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

In addition, the covariance

$$\mathrm{Cov}[B_1, B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] = n^4 \mathrm{Cov}[N_1, N_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] = O(n^{3.5}\Omega(n)) = o(n^4).$$

For any bounded region $R$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty,\delta_1\to 0}\ \sup_{(x_1,x_2)\in R} |P(N_1\le x_1)P(N_2\le x_2) - P(N_1\le x_1, N_2\le x_2)| = 0.$$

Under Condition 1, $\mathrm{Var}[N_j; i_1, i_2, i_3]$ $(j = 1, 2)$ are bounded, in addition, when $n\to\infty$, the probability that Condition 1 holds approaches 1. Thus,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(A_1, A_2|v_1\sim v_2) - P(A_1|v_1\sim v_2)P(A_2|v_1\sim v_2) = 0.$$

When $v_1$ is not adjacent to $v_2$, by similar argument, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(A_1, A_2|v_1\nsim v_2) - P(A_1|v_1\nsim v_2)P(A_2|v_1\nsim v_2) = 0.$$

Thus the equality $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{Cov}[X_1, X_2] = 0$ holds. Lemma 3 is proved.

We go back to the final proof of Theorem 1, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\left|\frac{N(n)}{n} - \Phi(1)\right| > \epsilon\right)\\ \le &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n)}{n} - E[X_1]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + P\left(|E[X_1] - \Phi(1)| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, when $n\to\infty$, the second term in the right side of the inequality above approaches 0. For the first term, by Chebyshev's Inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\left|\frac{N(n)}{n} - E[X_1]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\\ \le&\frac{4\mathrm{Var}[X_1 + \ldots + X_n]}{n^2\epsilon^2}.\end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Var}[X_1 + \ldots + X_n]\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{Var}[X_1] + 2\sum_{i<j}\mathrm{Cov}[X_i, X_j]\\ <&n + n(n-1)\mathrm{Cov}[X_1, X_2] = o(n^2),\end{aligned}$$

so the first term also approaches 0 as $n\to\infty$. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.

## 3 In The Complete Bipartite Random Graph $B(n_1, n_2, p)$

In the complete bipartite random graph $G = B(n_1, n_2, p)$, where $0 < p < 1$ is fixed, when $n_1$ and $n_2$ approaches infinity, the asymptotic behavior of the proportion of groupies in $G$ depends on the ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$. Suppose this ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$ has a limit $\alpha \geq 0$ as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\alpha \leq 1$. If $|n_1 - n_2| \to \infty$, the proportion of groupies in $G$ converges in probability towards $\frac{1}{1+\alpha}$.

**Theorem 4** *Suppose $G = B(n_1, n_2, p)$, $0 < p < 1$, is a complete bipartite random graph with $n = n_1 + n_2$ vertices. Let $N(n_1, n_2)$ be the number of groupies in $G$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1, n_2)}{n} - \frac{1}{1+\alpha}\right| > \epsilon\right) \to 0,$$

*as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, $\frac{n_1}{n_2} \to \alpha \leq 1$, and $|n_1 - n_2| = c(n) \to \infty$.*

Denote the two parts $P_1, P_2$ of vertices in $G$ by $v_{1,1}, v_{1,2}, \ldots, v_{1,n_1}$, and $v_{2,1}, v_{2,2}, \ldots, v_{2,n_2}$. Let $A_{j,k}$ be the event that the vertex $v_{j,k}$ is a groupie, where $j = 1, 2$, and $1 \leq k \leq n_j$; $E_{j,k}$ the characteristic function of the event $A_{j,k}$, i.e., $E_{j,k} = 1_{A_{j,k}}$.

We claim that for vertices $v_{1,k}$ in the part $P_1$, the probability that $v_{1,k}$ is a groupie approaches 0, and for vertices $v_{2,k}$ in the part $P_2$, the probability that $v_{2,k}$ is a groupie approaches 1.

**Lemma 5** *As $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, if $n_1 - n_2 \to -\infty$, then*

$$\lim E[X_{1,1}] = 0,$$

$$\lim E[X_{2,1}] = 1.$$

Note that $E[X_{j,1}] = P(A_{j,1}) = P(A_{j,k})$, for any $j = 1, 2$, and $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n_1$. We may first exclude the case that vertices $v_{1,1}$ or $v_{2,1}$ is isolated because its probability $(1-p)^{n_2}$ or $(1-p)^{n_1}$ approaches 0 as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$. We then estimate the value of $E[X_{1,1}]$. Suppose the vertex $v_{1,1}$ has degree $i$. Let $V_1$ be the set of $i$ vertices that are adjacent to $v_{1,1}$, and $V_2$ be the other $n_2 - i$ vertices in the set $P_2$ that are not adjacent to $v_{1,1}$. Let $e_j$ be the number of edges with one endpoint in the set $V_j$, where $j = 1, 2$, and another endpoint other than $v_{1,1}$. Then the event that $v_{1,1}$ is a groupie is equivalent to

$$\frac{e_1 + i}{i} \geq \frac{2(e_1 + e_2 + i)}{n_1 + n_2},$$

i.e.,

$$(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i \geq 0.$$

Note that $e_1$ is subject to the binomial distribution $B(i(n_1-1),p)$, and $e_2$ is subject to the binomial distribution $B((n_2-i)(n_1-1),p)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&E[(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i;i]\\ =&(n_1+n_2-2i)i(n_1-1)p-2i(n_2-i)(n_1-1)p+(n_1+n_2-2i)i\\ =&i((n_1-1)p(n_1-n_2)+(n_1+n_2-2i));\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Var}[(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i;i]\\ =&(n_1+n_2-2i)^2 i(n_1-1)p(1-p)-(2i)^2(n_2-i)(n_1-1)p(1-p)\\ =&i(n_1-1)p(1-p)(n_1^2+n_2^2+2n_1n_2-4in_1).\end{aligned}$$

Note that the degree $i$ of $v_{1,1}$ is subject to the binomial distribution $B(n_2,p)$. Thus for any $\epsilon_0>0$, when $n_2$ approaches infinity, we have $P(|i-n_2p| \geq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)) < \epsilon_0$.

Under the condition that $|i-n_2p| < n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$, we have

$$\mu \triangleq E[(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i;i] = O(n^2c(n)),$$

$$\sigma^2 \triangleq \mathrm{Var}[(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i;i] = O(n^4).$$

Note that $(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1-2ie_2+(n_1+n_2-2i)i$ is subject to the linear combination of binomial random variables. In addition, as $n_1,n_2\to\infty$, by the Berry-Esseen Theorem, there exists a constant $C$ which only depends on $p$, such that

$$\left|P(A_{1,1})-\Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)\right| < Cn^{-1}.$$

As $n_1,n_2\to\infty$, we have $\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\to-\infty$, then

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)\to 0.$$

In addition, by $P(|i-pn_2| \geq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)) < \epsilon_0$,

$$|P(A_{1,1})-P(A_{1,1};P(|i-pn_2| \geq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)) < \epsilon_0)| < \epsilon_0.$$

For the arbitrary selection of $\epsilon_0>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(A_{1,1}) = 0. \tag{3}$$

By similar argument, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(A_{2,1}) = 1. \tag{4}$$

The proof of Lemma 5 is done. □

**Remark 1** *In Lemma 5 we do not need the condition that there is a limit* $\alpha$ *of* $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$*, as long as we have* $n_1 - n_2 \to -\infty$*.*

Then by (3) and (4),

$$\lim_{n_1,n_2\to\infty,\frac{n_1}{n_2}\to\alpha,|n_1-n_2|\to\infty} \mathrm{Cov}[X_{j_1,k_1}, X_{j_2,k_2}] = 0, \text{ where } (j_1,k_1) \neq (j_2,k_2).$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{1}{1+\alpha}\right| > \epsilon\right) \\ \leq &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{n_1}{n}E[X_{1,1}] - \frac{n_2}{n}E[X_{2,1}]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\ &+ P\left(\left|\frac{n_1}{n}E[X_{1,1}]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) + P\left(\left|\frac{n_2}{n}E[X_{2,1}] - \frac{1}{1+\alpha}\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5, when $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $\frac{n_1}{n_2} \to \alpha$, the second and third terms in the right side of the inequality above approaches to 0. For the first term, by Chebyshev's Inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{n_1}{n}E[X_{1,1}] - \frac{n_2}{n}E[X_{2,1}]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\ \leq &\frac{9\mathrm{Var}[X_{1,1} + \ldots + X_{1,n_1} + X_{2,1} + \ldots + X_{2,n_2}]}{n^2\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Var}[X_{1,1} + \ldots + X_{1,n_1} + X_{2,1} + \ldots + X_{2,n_2}] \\ =&\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \mathrm{Var}[X_{1,k}] + \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} \mathrm{Var}[X_{2,k}] + 2\sum_{(j_1,k_1)\neq(j_2,k_2)} \mathrm{Cov}[X_{j_1,k_1}, X_{j_2,k_2}] \\ <&n + n(n-1)\mathrm{Cov}[X_1, X_2] = o(n^2), \end{aligned}$$

so the first term also approaches to 0 as $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4. □

For the case of $\alpha = 1$, we claim that the limit of proportion of groupies can be determined by the difference $c$ of the number of vertices in the two parts. By the symmetry of the two parts, we may assume $c = n_1 - n_2 > 0$. In the following argument, let $n_1$ and $n_2$ approaches infinity with the difference $c = n_1 - n_2$ fixed, then the proportion of groupies in bipartite graph $B(n_1, n_2, p)$ converges in probability towards $\frac{1}{2}(\Phi(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}) + \Phi(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}))$.

**Theorem 6** *Suppose $G = B(n_1, n_2, p)$, $0 < p < 1$, is a complete bipartite random graph with $n = n_1 + n_2$ vertices. Let $N(n_1, n_2)$ be the number of groupies in $G$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, and $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1, n_2)}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right) + \Phi\left(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)\right)\right| > \epsilon\right) \to 0,$$

*as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $n_1 - n_2 = c$.*

We use the same notations in the proof of Theorem 4. As the number of vertices goes to infinite, the probability that the vertex $v_{1,k}$ (or $v_{2,k}$) in part $P_1$ (or $P_2$) approaches to $\Phi(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)})$ (or $\Phi(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)})$).

**Lemma 7**

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \to \infty, n_1 - n_2 = c} E[X_{1,1}] = \Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right),$$

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \to \infty, n_1 - n_2 = c} E[X_{2,1}] = \Phi\left(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right).$$

The proofs of the two equalities are similar, so we just give the proof of the first one. The event that the vertex $v_{1,1}$ is a groupie, is equivalent to

$$(n_1 + n_2 - 2i)e_1 - 2ie_2 + (n_1 + n_2 - 2i)i \geq 0.$$

Given the condition $n_1 - n_2 = c$ and the value of $i$, the conditional expectation

$$\begin{aligned}\mu \triangleq & E[(n_1 + n_2 - 2i)e_1 - 2ie_2 + (n_1 + n_2 - 2i)i; i] \\ = & i((n_1 - 1)p(n_1 - n_2) + (n_1 + n_2 - 2i)) \\ = & i((n_2 + c - 1)pc + (2n_2 + c - 2i));\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2 \triangleq& \mathrm{Var}[(n_1+n_2-2i)e_1 - 2ie_2 + (n_1+n_2-2i)i; i]\\ =& i(n_1-1)p(1-p)(n_1^2+n_2^2+2n_1n_2-4in_1).\end{aligned}$$

Fix the value of $i$ under the condition $|i-n_2p| < n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$, by the 1-dimentional Berry-Esseen theorem and Proposition 1, we have

$$|P(v_{1,1} \text{ is a groupie}; |i-n_2p| < n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)) - \Phi(\frac{\mu}{\sigma})| = O(n^{-1}).$$

Note that as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $n_1 - n_2 = c$,

$$\lim \Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) = \Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right).$$

In addition, the condition $|i-n_2p| < n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$ holds with probability $1 - o(1)$. Thus

$$\lim_{n_1,n_2\to\infty, n_1-n_2=c} E[X_{1,1}] = \Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)$$

holds. □

For the covariance of the random variables $X_{j,k}$, where $j = 1, 2$ and $1 \le k \le n_j$, it approaches 0, as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$ and $n_1 - n_2 = c$.

**Lemma 8** *As $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$ and $n_1 - n_2 = c$, the covariance of characteristic functions of two distinct events $A_{j,k}$ approaches 0, i.e., for any two distinct pairs $(j_1, k_1)$ and $(j_2, k_2)$,*

$$\lim Cov[X_{j_1,k_1}, X_{j_2,k_2}] = 0.$$

By the symmetry of the complete bipartite random graph $B(n_1, n_2, p)$, we only need to show that

$$\lim \mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}] = 0, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\lim \mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1}, X_{2,1}] = 0. \tag{6}$$

For the proof of equality (5), the notations are defined as follows. Let $V_1$ be the set of vertices in part $P_2$ which are adjacent to $v_{1,1}$, but not adjacent to $v_{1,2}$; $V_2$ the set of vertices in part $P_2$ which are adjacent to both $v_{1,1}$ and $v_{1,2}$; $V_3$ the set of vertices in part $P_2$ which are adjacent to $v_{1,2}$, but not adjacent to $v_{1,1}$; $V_4$ the set of vertices in part $P_2$ which are not adjacent to either $v_{1,1}$ or $v_{1,2}$. Let $i_j$ be the size $|V_j|$, and $e_j$ the number of edges between part $P_1$ (other than $v_{1,1}, v_{1,2}$) and vertex set $V_j$ in $P_2$, where $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then there is a relation $i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 = n_2$.

Thus the event $A_{1,1}$ that the vertex $v_{1,1}$ is a groupie is equivalent to

$$\frac{e_1 + e_2 + i_1 + 2i_2}{i_1 + i_2} \geq \frac{2(i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3 + e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4)}{n_1 + n_2}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 \triangleq & (n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + i_2))(e_1 + e_2) - 2(i_1 + i_2)(e_3 + e_4) \\ & + (i_1 + i_2)(n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3)) + i_2(n_1 + n_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the event $A_{1,2}$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 \triangleq & (n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_2 + i_3))(e_2 + e_3) - 2(i_2 + i_3)(e_1 + e_4) \\ & + (i_2 + i_3)(n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3)) + i_2(n_1 + n_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $i_1, i_2, i_3$ (and $i_4$) is fixed, $e_j$ is subject to binomial distribution $B(i_j(n_1 - 2), p)$, where $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Applying the relation that $n_1 - n_2 = c$ and by brute force, the conditional expectations of $B_1$ and $B_2$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3] =& (i_1 + i_2)((n_1 - 2)pc + n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3)) + i_2(n_1 + n_2) \\ E[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] =& (i_2 + i_3)((n_1 - 2)pc + n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3)) + i_2(n_1 + n_2). \end{aligned}$$

The conditional variance and covariance of $B_1$ and $B_2$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Var}[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3] =& (n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + i_2))^2 (i_1 + i_2)(n_1 - 2)p(1 - p) \\ & + 4(i_1 + i_2)^2 (i_3 + i_4)(n_1 - 2)p(1 - p) \\ \mathrm{Var}[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] =& (n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_2 + i_3))^2 (i_2 + i_3)(n_1 - 2)p(1 - p) \\ & + 4(i_2 + i_3)^2 (i_1 + i_4)(n_1 - 2)p(1 - p) \\ \mathrm{Cov}[B_1, B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] =& ((n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + i_2))(n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_2 + i_3))i_2 \\ & - 2(n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_1 + i_2))(i_2 + i_3)i_1 \\ & - 2(n_1 + n_2 - 2(i_2 + i_3))(i_1 + i_2)i_3 \\ & + 4(i_1 + i_2)(i_2 + i_3)i_4)(n_1 - 2)p(1 - p). \end{aligned}$$

Analogue to the argument for the complete random graph $B(n, p)$, note that $i_1 \sim B(n_2, p(1 - p))$, $i_2 \sim B(n_2, p^2)$, and $i_3 \sim B(n_2, p(1 - p))$. Then the condition

**Condition 2** $|i_1 - n_2p(1-p)| \leq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$, $|i_2 - n_2p^2| \leq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$, $|i_3 - n_2p(1-p)| \leq n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2)$

holds with probability $1 - o(1)$ as $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $n_1 - n_2 = c$. Under this condition,

$$\begin{aligned} E[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= O(n^2), \\ E[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= O(n^2), \\ \mathrm{Var}[B_1; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= O(n^4), \\ \mathrm{Var}[B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] &= O(n^4), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Cov}[B_1, B_2; i_1, i_2, i_3] = o(n^4).$$

By the same argument for complete random graph $B(n,p)$, we use the normal distribution with the same expectation and covariance matrix of $(\frac{B_1}{n^2}, \frac{B_2}{n^2})$, to estimate the random vector $(\frac{B_1}{n^2}, \frac{B_2}{n^2})$, and finally get

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \to \infty, n_1 - n_2 = c} \mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1}, X_{1,2}] = 0.$$

For the proof of equality (6), the notations are defined as follows: Let $V_1$ be the set of vertices other than $v_{2,1}$ in part $P_2$ which are adjacent to $v_{1,1}$; $V_2$ the set of vertices other than $v_{1,1}$ in part $P_1$ which are adjacent to $v_{2,1}$; $V_3$ the set of vertices other than $v_{2,1}$ in part $P_2$ which are not adjacent to $v_{1,1}$; $V_4$ the set of vertices other than $v_{1,1}$ in part $P_1$ which are not adjacent to $v_{2,1}$. Let $i_j$ be the size $|V_j|$ and $e_{j,k}$ the number of edges between vertex set $V_j$ and $V_k$, where $j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then there are relations $i_1 + i_3 = n_2 - 1$, and $i_2 + i_4 = n_1 - 1$. If $v_{1,1}$ and $v_{2,1}$ are not joined by an edge, then the event "$v_{1,1}$ is a groupie" is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 \triangleq & (n_1 + n_2 - i_1)(e_{1,2} + e_{1,4}) - i_1(e_{3,2} + e_{3,4}) \\ & + i_1(n_1 + n_2 - i_1 - i_2) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and the event "$v_{2,1}$ is a groupie" is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 \triangleq & (n_1 + n_2 - i_2)(e_{1,2} + e_{3,2}) - i_2(e_{1,4} + e_{3,4}) \\ & + i_2(n_1 + n_2 - i_1 - i_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Analogue to the argument for the equality (5), note that $i_1 \sim B(n_2 - 1, p)$, and $i_2 \sim B(n_1 - 1, p)$. Then the condition

**Condition 3** $|i_1 - (n_2 - 1)p| \le n_2^{0.5}\Omega(n_2),\ |i_2 - (n_1 - 1)p| \le n_1^{0.5}\Omega(n_1)$

holds with probability $1 - o(1)$ as $\delta_1 \to 0$, $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $n_1 - n_2 = c$. Under this condition, by brute force, we have

$$E[B_1; i_1, i_2] = O(n^2),$$

$$E[B_2; i_1, i_2] = O(n^2),$$

$$\mathrm{Var}[B_1; i_1, i_2] = O(n^4),$$

$$\mathrm{Var}[B_2; i_1, i_2] = O(n^4),$$

and

$$\mathrm{Cov}[B_1, B_2; i_1, i_2] = o(n^4).$$

By the same argument for complete random graph $B(n,p)$, we use the normal distribution with the same expectation and covariance matrix of $(\frac{B_1}{n^2}, \frac{B_2}{n^2})$, to estimate the random vector $(\frac{B_1}{n^2}, \frac{B_2}{n^2})$, and finally get

$$\lim_{n_1, n_2 \to \infty, n_1 - n_2 = c} \mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1}, X_{2,1}] = 0.$$

under the assumption that $v_{1,1}$ and $v_{2,1}$ are not adjacent. If $v_{1,1}$ and $v_{2,1}$ are adjacent to each other, the argument is similar. So the equality (6) holds. □

The remaining argument is similar to the case of $\frac{n_1}{n_2} \to \alpha$ and $|n_1 - n_2| \to \infty$. For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right) + \Phi\left(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)\right)\right| > \epsilon\right) \\ \le &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{n_1}{n}E[X_{1,1}] - \frac{n_2}{n}E[X_{2,1}]\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\ &+ P\left(\left|\frac{n_1}{n}E[X_{1,1}] - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)\right)\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\ &+ P\left(\left|\frac{n_2}{n}E[X_{2,1}] - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi\left(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)\right)\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7, when $n_1, n_2 \to \infty$, and $\frac{n_1}{n_2} \to \alpha$, the second and third terms in the right side of the inequality above approaches to 0. For the first term, by Chebyshev's Inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\left|\frac{N(n_1,n_2)}{n} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi\left(1 + \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right) + \Phi\left(1 - \frac{pc}{2(1-p)}\right)\right)\right| > \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right) \\ \le &\frac{9\mathrm{Var}[X_{1,1} + \ldots + X_{1,n_1} + X_{2,1} + \ldots + X_{2,n_2}]}{n^2\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}[X_{1,1}+\ldots+X_{1,n_1}+X_{2,1}+\ldots+X_{2,n_2}]\\
=&\sum_{k=1}^{n_1}\mathrm{Var}[X_{1,k}]+\sum_{k=1}^{n_2}\mathrm{Var}[X_{2,k}]+2\sum_{(j_1,k_1)\neq(j_2,k_2)}\mathrm{Cov}[X_{j_1,k_1},X_{j_2,k_2}]\\
<&n+n(n-1)(\mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1},X_{1,2}]+\mathrm{Cov}[X_{1,1},X_{2,1}])=o(n^2),
\end{aligned}$$

so the first term also approaches to 0 as $n\to\infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 6. □

If there is no limit for the ratio $\frac{n_1}{n_2}$ of vertices in the two parts, the proportion of groupies in $B(n_1,n_2,p)$ does not converge in probability, known from Lemma 5. By Theorem 4 and Theorem 6, we determine whether the proportion of groupies in complete bipartite random graphs $B(n_1,n_2,p)$ converges in probability as the number of vertices $n_1$ and $n_2$ in the two parts both approaches infinity in general, and give the limit if it converges in probability.

## Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Professor Chunwei Song for his useful comments and suggestions.

## References

[1] Miklós Ajtai, János Komlós, and Endre Szemerédi. A note on Ramsey numbers. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 29(3):354–360, 1980.

[2] Harald Bergström. On the central limit theorem in the space $R_k, k>1$. *Skand. Aktuarietidskr.*, 28:106–127, 1945.

[3] Andrew C. Berry. The accuracy of the Gaussian approximation to the sum of independent variates. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 49:122–136, 1941.

[4] E. Bertram, P. Erdős, P. Horák, J. Širáň, and Zs. Tuza. Local and global average degree in graphs and multigraphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 18(7):647–661, 1994.

[5] Kai Lai Chung. Asymptotic distribution of the maximum cumulative sum of independent random variables. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 54:1162–1170, 1948.

[6] W. Fernandez de la Vega and Zsolt Tuza. Groupies in random graphs. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 109(7):339–340, 2009.

[7] Carl-Gustav Esseen. On the Liapounoff limit of error in the theory of probability. *Ark. Mat. Astr. Fys.*, 28A(9):19, 1942.

[8] Pak Tung Ho. On groupies in graphs. *Australas. J. Combin.*, 38:173–177, 2007.

[9] John Mackey. A lower bound for groupies in graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 21(3):323–326, 1996.

[10] Svatopluk Poljak, Tamás Szabó, and Zsolt Tuza. Extremum and convergence of local average degrees in graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 1995)*, volume 112, pages 191–198, 1995.

[11] Yilun Shang. Groupies in random bipartite graphs. *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.*, 4(2):278–283, 2010.